Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*
Combined with the Magazine ANALYSIS
Editorial Office 1710 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066
VOL. VIII, NO. ~~42,~~ *Issue Number* 403, OCTOBER ~~17,~~ 1951 ★ *Editor:* FRANK C. HANIGHEN ★ *Associate Editor:* FRANK CHODOROV

FEB '52

AND NOW THE SMEAR OF THE McCARRAN COMMITTEE

By Freda Utley

The "revisionist" school, and others who have tried to lift the historical blackout, have reason to be grateful to the 82nd Congress. Both the hearings of the Senate Joint Committee which investigated General MacArthur's recall, and the present investigations of the McCarran Internal Security Committee, have revealed vital facts hitherto successfully hidden, or obscured by the professors, journalists and politicians who strive to justify the ways of Roosevelt and Truman to the world.

Bit by bit the missing pieces of the jigsaw puzzle which, when completed, will present the whole tragic story of United States policy during and after the war, are being found and fitted into place. Evidence is also piling up concerning the individuals mainly responsible for our having "snatched defeat out of the very jaws of victory". It is as yet impossible to distinguish the goats from the asses. We do not know, and may never know, who among our policy makers were Communist sympathizers, and who were just plain dumb and incompetent, or actuated by the ambition to make good in the era when it was profitable to be pink, and safe to be red. But there is no longer any doubt that the influence of the Chinese Communist cabal in Washington accounts for the policy which turned China into our enemy, and led to the Korean war.

The revelations made by Eugene Dooman, Harold Stassen, Louis Budenz and Professors Colegrove and McGovern of Northwestern University, to mention only a few of the witnesses who have appeared before the McCarran Committee, are so damaging to the "men of Yalta", including General Marshall, that it was to be expected that an effort would be made to discredit them and the McCarran Committee. Mr. Joseph Alsop, long an apologist for the Roosevelt and Truman foreign policy, led the attack.

Specifically, Alsop charged that the McCarran Committee was taking false testimony, to wit: Budenz's statement that John Carter Vincent was a Communist is disproved, according to Alsop, by the anti-Communist recommendations made by Wallace in his cable to the President from New Delhi on June 28, 1944. Vincent accompanied and advised Mr. Wallace during his mission to China and Siberia in that year. As evidence of

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the anti-Communist advice given by Wallace after consultation with Vincent, Alsop cited the fact that he recommended the replacement of Stilwell by the anti-Communist General Wedemeyer.

II

For a few days it seemed that this thesis served to discredit the testimony of Budenz, and also the credibility of the case being built against the Far Eastern division of the State Department and the Institute of Pacific Relations. But on September 28, Professor William M. McGovern who, during the war, served with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and really knows the score, turned the tables. McGovern testified that in 1944 General Wedemeyer, far from having been known as an anti-Communist, "had never expressed his views on Communism" and was regarded as a "Marshall man" who could be relied upon to "go along with the Communists". According to McGovern, Wedemeyer "had served as spokesman for Marshall on several occasions in discussion with the British planners"; so that "some people wrongly thought that Wedemeyer would go along with the Communists because, with the Joint Chiefs, he thought we should not invade the Balkans or interfere with the Russian campaign in Eastern Europe".

Other well-informed persons, who cannot be quoted because they still work for the Government, have informed me that Wedemeyer's first appointment to the East was due to Winston Churchill's desire to remove from Washington the man whom Marshall relied upon to squash British plans for a strategy designed to delay invasion of Western Europe and to keep the Russians out of Eastern Europe.

From all the evidence available, it would seem that until he went to China, and had his eyes opened to the Communist menace, Wedemeyer had been a military planner whose sole aim was to win the war as quickly as possible with the least loss of American lives. Initially he rose from the rank of Major at the beginning of the war to that of a three-star General, thanks to General Marshall. The latter, recognizing his brilliant talents, had selected him to draw up the plans for the cross-channel invasion of Europe. In short, Wedemeyer was everywhere regarded as a loyal adherent of Marshall's policies.

According to Budenz, who supported his assertions with copies of articles in the Daily Worker in 1944, Stilwell's recall and Wedemeyer's appointment to China were regarded by the Communists not merely as a useful compromise, but as potentially advantageous to their cause. In the first place, it eliminated any possibility that General Chennault might get the appointment -- a contingency which the Reds had greatly feared because he was known to be strongly anti-Communist.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the second place they hoped that Wedemeyer would succeed (where Stilwell with his rough approach had failed) in persuading Chiang Kai-shek to give way to Communist demands, and remove the blockade which had hitherto to some extent kept them in check while the Nationalists fought Japan. Wallace, in recommending Wedemeyer, cabled Roosevelt that he was "persona grata" to Chiang and suitable for the post because "it should go to a man who can establish himself in Chiang's confidence to a degree that the latter will accept his advice in regard to political as well as military actions". Specifically, Wallace hoped that Wedemeyer would persuade Chiang to "establish at least a semblance of the United Front" and subordinate all other considerations to the necessity of "reaching an understanding with Russia."

On October 5, 1951, in his second appearance as a witness before the McCarran Committee, Budenz explained in detail what the Communist Party line had been in 1944 and how closely it resembled that of Wallace in the latter's recommendations to the President, while being "guided into the right channels" by Vincent and Lattimore. The Communists realized at this time that it was premature to try to "sell" the idea of a coalition government in America. It was first necessary completely to discredit Chiang Kai-shek by representing him as inefficient, incompetent and reactionary. In Professor McGovern's words, the Wallace recommendations "gave aid and comfort to the Communists, trying to disparage the National Government entirely, and trying to throw his weight behind support of a pro-Russian policy".

III

Since the attackers of the McCarran Committee have shown acquaintance with the political and historical material on this phase of China's story, it is difficult to understand how they overlooked the above points. Surely, they could not have been ignorant that previously Wedemeyer had been regarded as one of the Marshall "Trust Stalin" school and one of the strategists who had placed "winning the war" above political consequences. It should have been easy to find out what the Communist line was on the matter; to note that the Daily Worker in 1944 pronounced itself as eminently satisfied with the results of Henry Wallace's mission. Indeed, that paper went so far as to compare the Vice-President favorably with Browder -- in a review of Wallace's pamphlet on the Pacific, published by the Institute of Pacific Relations, written for Wallace by Mrs. Lattimore.

We can expect more assaults by pro-Administration columnists. The guns are being trained on Stassen, once deemed a "liberal" Republican,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but already the subject of an abusive column by Lowell Mellett (Washington Star, October 6) for revealing the influence enjoyed in the State Department by Owen Lattimore and other admirers of the Chinese Communists.

Were it not for the fact that the reporting of the proceedings of the McCarran Committee has for the most part been, to say the least, inadequate, the critics of the Committee would have no chance of success in their efforts. Unfortunately, there has been what amounts to a conspiracy of silence concerning the most important facts revealed by the key witnesses before the McCarran Committee. McGovern's important testimony about Wedemeyer has been practically ignored. Budenz's testimony has been only partially reported. Moreover, when Mr. Lattimore chooses to make a statement it is usually reproduced in extenso by the New York Times and by most other newspapers; whereas the Times failed to report McGovern's testimony that Lattimore wanted the Japanese Emperor and his family treated as war criminals.

The New York Times, which once did publish "All the News That's Fit to Print", now ignores important testimony from Eugene Dooman, assistant to Secretary Grew. Dooman testified that General Marshall (in the spring of 1945) held up as "premature" a statement which Grew and the Secretaries of State and War had approved, assuring the Japanese that their Emperor would not be deposed if they surrendered. The effect of withholding this announcement was to help prolong the Pacific War until the Soviet Union was ready to come in to harvest the fruits of Yalta.

Most newspapers rely on the news agencies whose Washington correspondents tend to concentrate on a highly competitive battle to obtain "spot" news. Therefore, the public is being kept in ignorance concerning the highly important information which the McCarran Committee is painstakingly accumulating, while refraining from pronouncing any judgments, or seeking publicity, until all available evidence is obtained.

IV

The present campaign to discredit the valuable Congressional group, combined with unsatisfactory reporting by most of the press, give grounds for real apprehension. Have we entered the era which may end in the grim world depicted in George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-four, when knowledge of all facts which do not serve the interests of the ruling party are consigned to limbo?

Freda Utley is the author of The China Story -- a current best seller.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events Vol. VIII, No. 41

By Frank C. Hanighen October 10, 1951

LIBRARY 51

VINSON: We have talked with persons who have recently talked with President Truman. They confirm stories that the President still converses about how he'd prefer to retire in '52. He'd like a rest. He'd like to be free of Executive cares. He'd like to be free to speak his mind! So runs a not unfamiliar refrain. But of one thing -- his successor -- he makes no bones; he would like Chief Justice Vinson to take his place. Naturally -- so our informants' reports go on -- this is "iffy", and the President might "have" to run, etc.

The above reports strengthen the opinion that, if the President doesn't feel great compulsion to run, Mr. Vinson will be his anointed choice to run at the head of the Democratic ticket and few doubt that in such case the Chief Justice will be accepted by the Convention. In that eventuality, could the Chief Justice keep the Southerners in line? That is a question which receives tireless (and sometime tiresome) discussion in the Capital these days.

On the one hand, we hear, from individuals who ought to know, that Governor James F. Byrnes has sent to the White House the following virtual ultimatum: if Truman runs, the Governor will fight him; if Vinson runs, Byrnes will not oppose. On the other hand, reports from Gatlinburg (where Byrnes played a dominating and vocal role in the Governors' conference last week), say that Byrnes showed only slightly less enthusiasm towards the Chief Justice than he did towards the President. We get the impression that Byrnes prefers to leave the Vinson matter up in the air.

Such an attitude would not be surprising. Although a Kentuckian (and therefore presumably acceptable to the South), Vinson has been regarded as a "New Dealer" -- maybe a middle-of-the-road New Dealer -- but New Dealish for sure. How he stands now on such legislation as FEPC is unknown. In one case of this nature he proved evasive. But the Chief Justice may have an opportunity to reveal his attitude clearly in coming decisions of the Court. There is at least one case, involving segregation, which may well be before the Nine ere long.

* * * * *

GROUND SWELL: There is some sort of political ground swell under way today. So far it is un-analyzed, un-formulated, un-led. What is it?

It is not a response to the Eisenhower boom. At Gatlinburg, where the Governors met last week, the press asked a lot of questions about the attitude of the State Executives towards the General's candidacy. Many of the questions were so framed that replies could be interpreted: "We're all for Ike." Actually, the real sense was: "If he wants to run, he'd better hurry up and say so"; with more than a touch of asperity. No lightning was visible at that Conference.

Nor is the ground swell a demand for a North-South coalition. A revolt against Truman has spread through the South and may later develop into cooperation with the GOP. In any case, no such movement could bring an affirmative response among Party office-holders now. Inhibitions of a sectarian political character must keep it closed and furtive at this time. The unwary naively reported the fact that none of the Governors "put any stock" in the Mundt Plan. It would be just as ludicrous to expect the members of a conspiracy to reveal its details at a press conference.

Would an announcement that Taft will run act as a conductor of the puzzling atmospheric phenomenon? Probably not. It is commonplace in Washington that the only surprise would be if Taft renounces the race.

None of the above is believed to have any connection with what looks like something new in political commotion on the horizon.

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The fact of the matter is that the shadow of General MacArthur lies heavy on Capitol Hill. What members of Congress cannot get off their mind is an accumulation of signs and portents, as follows:

(1) MacArthur ran second in the poll of the Republican Roundup Committee a month ago; those polled being delegates to the GOP 1948 Convention. (2) In the poll of the Manchester, N.H., Union Leader (reported in this column on September 19), the former Far Eastern Commander was an easy winner. (3) A great, spontaneous reception in Allentown, Pa., where MacArthur visited two weeks ago. An estimated 175,000 people came from many miles around.

Now, members of Congress keep staring at these items, the while they tell themselves (1) the General refused to run and meant it; (2) he's privately -- and not so privately -- for Taft; (3) he's too old; (4) no one was ever really drafted, etc.

But, it is agreed, some sort of popular movement for MacArthur is discernible. If it weren't the General, it would be someone else. It represents, apparently, a craving for a leader deserving of respect, for a man not a composite of slogans, but above all an individual who cannot in any way be described as a politician. Such a dream is probably unrealizable. But it seems destined to haunt the political scene for some time to come.

* * * * *

OBITER DICTA EX NEBRASKA: Out in the "sticks", of course, diction has not the cultured phrasing of an Acheson address, but it gets to the point. Thus, Congressman Buffett of the 2nd Nebraska district returns from home with the following epigrams by the boys in the country store:

"A bunch of Republicans talking about Eisenhower for President is like the College of Cardinals in Rome discussing their choice for Pope when they don't know whether or not he's a Catholic."

"Let's nominate a GOP candidate who can't be elected. For the last three presidential years we nominated candidates for no apparent reason than that they could be elected -- and weren't."

"Korea -- that unlicensed slaughter-house."

* * * * *

HEARD ON THE HILL: It was in a closed session of the Rules Committee and very glad the Senators were that it was "executive". For they were discussing the question of a vote of censure for Senator McCarthy -- as proposed by Senator Benton. A few of the Democrats displayed some avidity. But Senator Jenner of Indiana, Republican and sympathetic to McCarthy, held up a warning hand. "Wait a minute, gentlemen, he remarked. "Watch out -- you're going pretty far. Let's just take a hypothetical case. Supposing we were having an important debate on a crucial measure -- and supposing one of the members on the floor has had too much to drink, and wasn't in fit condition to discuss high matters of state. It might be necessary to discuss whether or not to censure such a member. And then the press would hear of it." The Democrats looked decidedly alarmed. They could recall some recent incidents. . . . Perhaps we won't hear so much about this censure proposal in the future.
---- Southern members were discussing the statement made by their former colleague, Governor James F. Byrnes, at the Governors conference in Tennessee. Governor Byrnes said that "In my speculation Mr. Truman will not be a candidate." One Southerner remarked: "Jimmy meant, 'Truman had better not be a candidate.'"
---- Senator Sparkman, at a meeting of the committee delving into corruption made a slip of the tongue which set the Hill laughing. He remarked solemnly, but too hastily, "The Committee will protect [the rights of] both innocent and guilty."
---- The laugh is on Senator Brien McMahon (Democrat). Chosen obviously as a prominent Catholic layman to "whitewash" Marshal Tito, the Senator from Connecticut journeyed to Yugoslavia and discovered in himself vast enthusiasm for the anti-Stalinist

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Communist. But, on October 8th, Tito (according to the A.P.) named the Catholic Church an "enemy" of Yugoslavia.

* * * * *

A ROPE, A TREE AND A BUTCHER KNIFE: If you're interested in your supply of steak this winter, you're interested in some statistics out of Omaha, the second largest slaughtering center in the country. These figures are bothering Mike DiSalle, too; indeed, so much that he is asking Congress for new controls over the meat market which, if granted, may cut your diet from chuck to hash.

So, here goes. In August, 1950, Armour & Co. slaughtered 27,000 head of cattle; in the same month this year, the total was nearly 14,500. Another legitimate slaughterer is Swift & Co.; their operations dropped from 20,000 head to just under 6,000. All the old line slaughterers likewise report a slowing up of business. The farmers are not bringing their cattle to them. Why? Ask Mike.

However, the total number of cattle purchased on the Omaha market actually increased in August, 1951, over August, 1950, by about 9,000. When you examine the figures, issued by the Union Stock Yards Company of Omaha, you note that some of the smaller concerns had increases; more importantly, "order buyers" jumped their purchases from 17,000 to 28,000, and "other buyers" from 34,000 to 61,000.

Thereby hangs a tale. These "order buyers" may be farmers who buy cattle to be fattened, or they may be others who don't tell you what they do with their cattle, and this applies also to the category of "other buyers". Surely, they don't eat all they buy. There is widespread suspicion that these fellows are taking advantage of the shortages created by Mike's regulations, and are doing a little slaughtering with no other equipment than a rope, a tree and a butcher knife.

Where do these fellows sell their meat? Wherever they can find a buyer who never heard about OPS. They might sell their product to "food locker" operators, who also do a little slaughtering on their own, but who do not sell meat, and are therefore not subject to Mike's regulations; they charge you only for the locker space you rent (but what charges!) and take the hide for profit.

Mike is asking that a quota be set on the number of head any concern may slaughter, the quota based on what it did last year. The object is to prevent the little fellows from taking the business away from the big houses and selling their meat goodness knows where, and at a price known only to two people in the world. New concerns will not be allowed; that is, competition, which -- as every Socialist knows -- is the wickedest thing in the world, will be cut down. Still, the big question remains: how will Mike prevent slaughtering by concerns whose plants consist of a rope, a tree and a butcher knife?

* * * * *

INDOCTRINATION BY SUGGESTION: It is inaccurate to say that the professorial community is propagating Communism. But, it is a fact, underlined by much evidence, that our college curricula are impregnated with Statism (of which Communism is only a species) and that the indoctrination of students in Statist tenets is a major enthusiasm among faculties.

Recently we were asked by a student at Northwestern University to supply her with material for the negative side of the subject: "Resolved, that the Federal Government should adopt a permanent program of wage and price control." The very title immediately suggests that a program -- temporary or permanent -- of price and wage control is possible; that it can be made operative. The underlying premise ignores or rejects the existence of economic laws that make any such program impotent to achieve its declared objective. The topic is "loaded".

We learned upon investigation that the subject for debate had been selected, not by students acting independently, but by a body under professorial guidance, and that it would be debated by college teams throughout the country. The selection committee consists of five faculty members, four of whom are designated to it by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

four intercollegiate debating fraternities, one by the Speech Association of America. This committee receives suggestions for debates from some 500 colleges at the beginning of each year. From all of these, five topics that seem to fit a consensus are selected by the committee and resubmitted to the college for another vote. The one receiving the highest vote becomes the subject of the year.

All five subjects chosen for the final vote this year were "loaded" in favor of Statism. The one mentioned was selected for 1951-52. Those taking the affirmative side will certainly have the advantage, simply because the audiences will have learned about the virtues of a controlled economy from their economics textbooks. Those taking the negative side will be hard put, for they will have to disprove what they have been taught; they will have to refute not only their opponents but also their professors. If they win the debate, will they flunk in their examinations?

It is this kind of indoctrination in Statism that is far more threatening to American individualism than the outright teaching of Communism.

* * * * *

UN WEEK: We hear that there's a movement a-foot to undermine a big international publicity stunt called "United Nations Week". The sixth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations will be on October 24 and that week is scheduled as a lustral period for worship of the extraordinary institution on the East River. Now, voices rise to question the origin, purposes and propriety of such an occasion. In fact, one prominent member of the DAR, Mrs. Madelon Leetch, has labelled it a "drive for world government, to enable foreign countries to write our laws, commandeer our defense, tax or confiscate our resources and try out citizens before alien courts".

It is reported that some members of various organizations listed as "cooperating" with the stunt are writing their officers asking "how come?". The list includes the Democratic Party, the Republican Party (another poser for Mr. Gabrielson), the American Farm Bureau Federation (does Allan Kline really want this?), Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, etc., etc.

"Peoples of the world look forward to October 24, the sixth anniversary of the United Nations, with confidence, hope and reverent rededication to peace with freedom" -- are the opening words of a brochure issued to boost the affair. Many Americans who contemplate the casualty lists of Heartbreak Ridge may not prove so reverent. Quite a few people regard the UN as a false symbol of "peace", designed to cover up the failures of a political Administration.

Nevertheless, as we read the booklet, we marvelled at the scope of the plan. It aims to get mayors, governors, heads of business, farm and labor organizations, schools and colleges, etc., goose-stepping behind the strange UN flag. Now a mayor may proclaim as official a UN Day in his city or he may hesitate before criticism of such. It remains to be seen whether mass ballyhoo for this extraordinary international hoax will triumph over the developing opposition. The one is highly organized and financed, the latter not at all. It's an old story.

* * * * *

LIBERTARIAN PAMPHLETS: The fall list of The Caxton Printers (Caldwell, Idaho) contains the gratifying news that they continue the publication of several excellent pamphlets in the libertarian tradition. We list them, in the order of our personal preference, and hope readers not familiar with these little books will make up the deficiency at once: ANTHEM, by Ayn Rand, $1.00; GIVE ME LIBERTY, by Rose Wilder Lane, $.50; FIAT INFLATION IN FRANCE, by Andrew Dickson White, $.50; THE REVOLUTION WAS, by Garet Garrett, $.50; FREEDOM IN AMERICA, by Virgil Jordan and Henry Hazlitt, $.25.

* * * * *

52 REMINDERS: When you're thinking of gifts for Christmas, think of HUMAN EVENTS. It's a gift that repeats itself 52 times. Special offer soon.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED